



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/804,240	03/18/2004	Zhenyu Wu	8109-2	7462		
22150	7590	04/02/2008	EXAMINER			
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797				PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2132						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
04/02/2008		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,240	WU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkat Perungavoor	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/2008.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/6/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant arguments regarding Claim 1 and Claim 28 are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Starting with the argument for Claim 1, the Applicant believes that the Office has failed to show mobile system for capturing video in real time.

Hartung discloses the mobile systems being a smart phone and laptop see Page 83 § Mobile DRM. And as it commonly known in the art that these devices have camera that capture data in real time.

And finally, the Applicant argues with regard to Claim 28 that the Office has failed to show a video data sequence has opposed to still images as in Barni.

Barni discloses the video surveillance data authentication see § 1. Introduction

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Digital Rights Management and Watermarking of Multimedia Content for M-Commerce Application by Hartung et al.(hereinafter Hartung).

Regarding Claim 1, Hartung discloses the authenticated acquisition subsystem for digitally watermarking video data having a one video camera for capturing and simultaneously watermarking see Fig. 5 item “Watermarking” & MPEP-4 DRM standardization; a video management subsystem in signal communication with authenticated acquisition subsystem for storage, viewing and verification of the digitally watermarked video data see Fig. 5 item “Client/receiver” & Page 83 “Mobile DRM” Par. 1-2; a secure wireless video transfer subsystem in signal communication between the acquisition and management subsystems see for automatically transferring the digitally watermarked video data whenever the mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem moves within wireless range of the video management subsystem see Fig. 5 item “Mobile IP network” & Fig. 6 “Network control layer”.

Regarding Claim 2, Hartung discloses the video database for storing video data see Fig. 2 item Video DB.

Regarding Claim 3, 16, Hartung discloses the intermittent signal communication between management subsystem and acquisition subsystem see § Watermark Technology Page 82 Par. 5 & 6.

Regarding Claim 4-7, 22-24, Hartung disclose the signature being applied, verified and displaying of video see Introduction Par. 3 & § MPEG-4 DRM standardization Par. 4.

Regarding Claim 8-9, 14, 18, 21, 25, 27, Hartung discloses the wireless client and wireless communication see Fig. 5.

Regarding Claim 10-11, Hartung discloses the watermarking of data and verifying of watermark see § MPEG-4 DRM standardization Par. 2.

Regarding Claim 12-13, 20, 26, Hartung discloses the playback device including a camera see § Mobile DRM Par. 1.

Regarding Claim 15, Hartung discloses the digitally watermarking video data having a one video camera for capturing and simultaneously watermarking see Fig. 5 item “Watermarking” & MPEP-4 DRM standardization; verifying the digitally watermarked video data see § MPEG-4 DRM standardization Par. 2; coordinating communications of video data by automatically transferring the digitally watermarked video data to the video management subsystem whenever the mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem moves within wireless range of the video management subsystem see Fig. 5 item “Mobile IP network” & Fig. 6 “Network control layer”.

Regarding Claim 17, Hartung discloses the storing of video data see Fig. 2 item Video DB.

Regarding Claim 19, Hartung discloses the compression see MPEG-4 DRM standardization Par. 1.

Regarding Claim 20 and 32, Hartung discloses the identity of watermarked video to indicate the presence of watermark and type of modifications done to it see Page 82 Par. 002.

Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robust Watermarking of Cartographic Images by Barni.

Regarding Claim 28, Barni discloses the plurality of block transform coefficients indicative of mobile video recording see § Introduction Par. 3, the coefficients collectively indicative of original video data sequence with a secure watermark see § Introduction Par. 6, the secure watermark comprising plurality of signatures see Fig. 10(a)-(g), including a robust identity signature to establish the identity of a watermarked mobile video recording(MVR) and to indicate the presence of a watermark, and a semi-fragile control signature to facilitate the characterization of the type of modifications done to a watermarked MVR see 5.1 Geometric Normalization.

Regarding Claim 29, Barni discloses the error-correcting signature and rate-distortion guided bit embedding see Fig. 11 & § 5.2 Overall Performance Par. 3.

Regarding Claim 31, Barni discloses the identity signature being error-correcting signature and rate-distortion guided bit see 3.1 The FBGN Approach.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkat Perungavoor whose telephone number is (571)272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/V. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2132
March 28, 2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132